

## **REMARKS**

Claims 23-36 have been added, and claims 1-36 are currently pending. Claims 1, 7, 21, 23 and 33 are independent claims. Reconsideration is kindly requested.

## **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's consideration of the references filed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 28, 2004.

## **DRAWINGS**

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed October 27, 2003.

## **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-22. In addition, Applicants note that the new claims 23-36 were previously allowed in parent application 10/692,863 except for a double-patenting rejection. This double-patenting rejection is believed to have been alleviated by way of this response. Therefore, Applicants request allowance of the present application.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

The Examiner rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph because "the glass plate," in line 3 allegedly lacks antecedent basis. Applicants disagree. As the Examiner will appreciate, "a glass plate," precedes "the glass plate," in claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 provides proper antecedent basis for "the glass plate," in line 3. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

### **PROVISIONAL DOUBLE-PATENTING REJECTION**

The Examiner provisionally rejects claims 1-22 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-16 of co-pending application number 10/692,863 ("863"). The present application is a continuation of the '863 application.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's provisional double-patenting rejection, Applicants have amended the present application to include new claims 23-36 which correspond to claims 1-16 of the '863 application. Further, Applicants expect the '863 application to go abandon for failure to respond as of July 24, 2006.

In a telephone conversation with Supervisory Patent Examiner Gregory J. Toatley, Jr., Examiner Toatley indicated that the action taken by Applicants in this response would be sufficient to alleviate the current provisional double-patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of the present application.

### **COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

The Examiner offers reasons why claims 1-22 of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record. In parent application serial no. 10/692,863, the Examiner offers reasons why new claims 23-37 of the present application (previously claims 1-14 of the parent application) are allowable over the prior art of record. Although Applicants agree that the various claimed limitations mentioned in the claims are not taught or suggested by the prior art

taken either singly or in combination, Applicants wish to emphasize that it is the language of each claim, including the interrelationships and interconnections between various claimed elements which is allowable over the prior art of record, and not the Examiner's paraphrasing of claim features which are not present in any of the allowed claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of above remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Andrew M. Waxman, Reg. No. 56,007, at the number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNES, DICKY & PIERCE, PLC

By

  
John A. Castellano  
Reg. No. 35,094

JAC/AMW:jcp  


P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, VA 20195  
(703) 668-8000